DOCUMENT RESUME

IR 004 059 ED 129 276

AUTHOR Baukus, Robert A.

"Making Cable Work" Project: Summary Statements, TITLE

September 27, 1975-January 29, 1976.

Connecticut Univ., Storrs. Inst. of Public INSTITUTION

Connecticut Commission for Higher Education, SPONS AGENCY

Hartford.

PUB DATE 76

NOTE 27p.: For related documents see IR 004 060-061

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Cable Television: *Conferences: *Participant

Satisfaction: Program Evaluation: Questionnaires;

*Workshops

IDENTIFIERS *Connecticut: *Making Cable Work Project

ABSTRACT

Responses to questionnaires completed by participants in a conference and three workshops on Connecticut cable television provided data on: (1) how respondents were informed of the conference; (2) fulfillment of expectations; (3) whether respondents would attend additional workshops; and (4) reactions to individual components of the conference and workshops. Tabular summaries are provided and the individual comments of participants are recorded. (EMH)

******************* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *

^{*} to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal

^{*} reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality

^{*} of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not

^{*} responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions * ********************

^{*} supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

R 004059



INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC SERVICE THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

STORRS, CONNECTICUT

SUMMARY STATEMENT : "MAKING CABLE WORK!" PROJECT*

Conference Evaluation, September 27, 1975, Hartford CATV

BY: Robert A. Baukus Special Research Technician 11/10/75

US DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN BEPRO-COSTO EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OF MAIN JATION OR GIN. AT NO. 1. POINTS OF ME OR OPINIONS TATES DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-ENT OFF. AS NATIONAL INSTITLE OF EDICATION POSITION OR POLICY.

*This survey was partially financed by a grant from the Commission for Higher Education, State of Connecticut, under Program IMPACT, College Community Service Programs, Title I of Higher Education Act of 1965.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

"MAKING CABLE WORK" PROJECT Conference Evaluation, September 27, 1975, Hartford CATV

- -Total of 68 participants responded to the Questionnaire.
- -73.5% of the respondents were informed about the conference via the conference flyer (58.8) and the conference mailing program (14.7). MCW information distribution to target population seems very adequate.
- -The majority of the respondents felt that the conference was what they had expected. Under the assumption that the participants had expected an adequate conference, this provides an overall indication of the quality of the conference.
- -60.3% of the respondents replied yes to the question 6 which asked if they would attend the workshops designed for council members. 27.9% did not answer question 6. Many added a third alternative to the two provided. (Don't Know). It may be safe to assume that a fair percentage of the 27.9% will consider attending when information and dates are released.

-Topics-Comments

(#2) Options for cable in Connecticut and Federal Development Policy were not rated by the respondent very favorably (see data summary sheets).

Kalba's presentation Least Liked

Kalba's content and Ungar's content uniform negative EVALUATION

(#3) Policy

"-assume responsibility that public sector has not assumed."
-from cable people-"focus not clear if directing information for

layman"--

"should have been more of a "nuts & bolts"

"-conference at end not beginning of project"

"-workshop at cable company"

"-basics of public access"

"MAKING CABLE WORK"

Confidential Appraisal of the Conference:
"Public Use of Public Channels"

1)	How did you learn about the conference	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ	MODAL
	Through the conference flyer	40	58.8	*
	IPS Newsletter	3	4.4	
	Local Advisory Council	3	4.4	
	Town Chief Executive	1 1	1.5	
	Conference program mailing	10	14.7	
	Superintendent of Schools	1 1	. 1.5	
	Other (specify)	. 10	14.7	
	(friends & co-workers)			

2) You came to this conference with some sort of expectation as to what you might get out of it. Would you tell us whether, all in all, the conference:

		ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ	MODAL
a)	amply measured up to your expectations	17	25.0	
b)	was about what you had hoped	35	51.5	*
c)	fell short of what you expected	16	23.5	

3) What did you like most about the Conference?

Please evaluate the following items on a 1-5 scale (1 = very poor, 2 = poor, 3 = adequate, 4 = good, and 5 = excellent). Circle one.

Morning Session (Charts Topic I & II)

Topic | "Public Interest in Cable"

a. Content | 2 3 4 5

b. Presentation | 1 2 3 4 5

c. Other (specify)

Top	ic ii "Options for	Cable	in C	onne	CTIC	JT.
a.	Content	. 1	2	3	4	5
b.	Presentation	1	2	3	4	5
•	Other (enectfy)					

c. Other (specify)

Topic III "Federal Development Policy" a. Content I 2 3

a. Content | 2 3 4 5 b. Presentation | 1 2 3 4 5

c. Other (specify)

-3TOPIC I " PUBLIC INTEREST IN CABLE"

	CON	TENT	
	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	MODAL RESPONSE
I. Very P∞r	3	4.4	
2. Poor	3,	4.4	
3. Adequate	12	17.6	
4. Good	34	50.0	*
5. Excellent	. 13	19.1	
6. No Answer	3	4.4	

	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	MODAL RESPONSE
I. Very Poor	2	2.9	
2. Poor	1	1.5	
3. Adequate	10	14.7	
4. Good	29	42.6	*
5. Excellent	25	36.8	
6. No Answer	1	1.5	,

TOPIC II "OPTIONS FOR CABLE IN CONNECTICUT"

CONTENT

	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	MODAL RESPONSE
I. Very Poor	. 3	2.9	
2. Poor	12	17.6	
3. Adequate	20	29.4	*
4. Good	-19	27.9	
5. Excellent	12	17.6	
6. No Answer	3	4.4	·

	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	MODAL RESPONSE
I. Very Poor	. 4	5.9	
2. Poor	10	14.7	
3. Adequate	28	41.2	*
4. Good	15	22.1	
5. Excellent	9	13.2	
6. No Answer	2	2.9	

-5-

TOPIC III "FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY"

CONTENT

	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	MODAL RESPONSE
1. Very Poor	3	4.4	
2. Poor	11	16.2	
3. Adequate	22	32.4	*
4. Good	22	32.4	
5. Excellent	9	13.2	
6. No Answer	ı	1.5	

	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	MODAL RESPONSE
I. Very Poor	1	1.5 ,	
2. Poor	10	14.7	
3. Adequate	20	29.4	*
4. Good	18	26.5	
5. Excellent	18	26.5	
6. No Answer	ı	1.5	

-6PANEL DISCUSSION "PUBLIC POLICY AND PUBLIC USE"

CONTENT

	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	MODAL RESPONSE
1. Very Poor	. 3	4.4	
2. Poor	6	8.8	
3. Adequate	19	27.9	
4. Good	21	30.9	*
5. Excellent	14	20.6	
6. No Answer	5	7.4	

	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	MODAL RESPONSE
I. Very Poor	2	2.9	
2. Poor	4	5.9	
3. Adequate	18	26.5	
4. Good	25	36.8	*
5. Excellent	12	17.6	
6. No Answer	7	10.3	

QUESTION 4 & Other Comments (Ques. 3)

TYPICAL COMMENTS

"need more facts, less rhetoric!"

"smaller discussion groups chaired by a panelist"

"lack of technical aspects"

"panel too large - not enough audience participation"

"material presented was too general in scope"

"what about multi-media presentations"

"many people said everything was fine (appx. 16)

"too much on Hartford"

"the studio setting"

5) Are you a member of a Local Advisory Council?

	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	MODAL
Yes	31	45.6	
No	33	48.6	*
No Answer	4	5.9	

6) Would you attend a series of three (3) workshops designed for Council members?

	ABSOLUTE FREQ	RELATIVE FREQ (%)	MODAL
Yes	41	60.3	*
No .	8	11.8	
No Answer	19	27.9	

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
STORRS, CONNECTICUT

SUMMARY STATEMENT "MAKING CABLE WORK" PROJECT*

- 1) WORKSHOP # 1 NOVEMBER 22, 1975 VALLEY CABLEVISION, INC.
 Seymour
- 2) WORKSHOP # 2 DECEMBER 6, 1975 UNIVERSITY OF BRIDGEPORT

BY: Robert A. Baukus Special Research Technician 1-19-76

^{*} This survey was partially financed by a grant from the Commission for Higher Education, State of Connecticut, under Program IMPACT, College Community Service Programs, Title 1 of Higher Education Act of 1965.

"MAKING CABLE WORK" PROJECT Summary Statement

Evaluation - WORKSHOP # 1

Total Number of Returned Questionnaires - 17

1) Did you find the portapak demonstration useful?

	1	2	3	4	5	0 = no
	Extremely Useful	Very Useful	Fairly Useful	Little Use	Not Uset At All	ul reply
Absolute Frequency	4	5	5	2	1	2
Percentag	ge 21.1	26.3	26.3	10.5	5.3	10.5

2) Did you have previous "hands on" experience with the portapak?

	Yes //	No /	0 =	no reply
Absolute Frequency	11	6	2	
Percentage	57.9	31.6	10.5	

3) Do you feel that you NOW have enough knowledge of the portapak to use it to develop tapes for access programming?

0 = no reply

		2	3	
	eel Confident of Your bility to Use Portapak	Know Enough to Handle Portapak	Need More Practice	
Absolute Frequency	7	0	9	3
Percentage	36.8	0	47.4	15.8

4) Do you feel that the workshop has improved your ability to become active in the organization of a community access channel?

				2		3	4	
	Great	Improvement	Some	Improvement	Little	Improvement	No	Improvement
Absolute Frequency		3		9		4	1	2

0 = no reply

Frequency 3 9 4 1 2
Percentage 15.8 47.4 21.1 5.3 10.5

5) Are there additional topic areas you would like to have covered in the workshop discussion of community access channels? Please comment.

Total Number of Comments = 9

Summary comments:

- 1. "limitations on programming content"
- 2. "'need for funding' paid staff"
- 3. "'how to' list for the novice"
- 4. "more examples of community access"
- 5. "successful approaches to getting organized"
- 6. "viewing reading access videotapes"
- 7. "state funding sources"
- 8. "how to increase community access"
- 9. "working with citizens, elderly, etc."
- 6) Do you feel that the workshop has improved your ability to become active in the organization of an educational access channel? 0 = no reply

			2	3	4	
Great	Improvement	Some	Improvement	Little Improvement	No Improvement At All	
Absolute Frequency	4		9	5	1	0
Percentage	21.1		47.4	26.3	5.0	0

7) Are there any additional topic areas you would like to have covered in the workshop discussion of educational access channels? Please comment.

Total number of comments = 5

Summary comments:

- I)"case studies"
- 2)"actual productions of an educational program"
- 3)"finding details"
- 4) "representatives from a well developed educational access channel."
- 5) "examples of advanced uses"
- 8) How would you rate overall utility of this workshop?
- 0 = no reply

- 1			2	3	4	5	
Extre Usefu			Very Useful	Fairly Useful	Little Use	Not Useful At All	
Absolute Frequency	2	,	6	7	2	0	2
Percentage	10.5		31.6	36.8	10.5	0	10.5

9) Are	you a member	of a local a	dvisory council	? Yes <u></u>		
				No /		reply
Name	e of Participa	nt		(optio	nal)	
Mun	icipality or C			(optio	nal)	
Any	suggestions o	n the format	for future wor	kshops?		
Absolute Frequency				10	9	0
Percentage				52.6	47.4	0
		Total number	of comments =	4		
Sumr	mary statement	s:				
1)	"small group m		rotates to prod	uce more 1	nteraction	
2)	presiding off should partic		conform +o prin	ted agenda	speaker	
3) '	"more first ha	nd experienc	es of access ch	annels and	fundings"	
4)	"more examples	of advanced	and sophistica	ted uses"		
10) D1	d y ou attend t	he September	26th Conference	e at CPTV?	Yes //	
					No /	
				0 =	no reply	
Absolute Frequency				12	7	0
Percentage				<u>63</u>	.2 36.8	0
II) How	did you learn	about the w	orksho _ř ? (check	the follo	wing)	
	IPS Newslett	er	1	Town Libra	rlan	5
	Workshop Mai	ling	2	Council Ch	airman	
	Town Chief E	xecutive	-	Franchise	Operator	
	Superintende	ent of School				
Absolute Frequency		2	4	5	0	
Percentage	9 47.4	6 31.6	1 5.3	2 10.5	I 5.3	

12) Do you plan to otherid future workshops in Bridgoport and Moridan?

Yes		No /	C	= no.	reply
Absolute Frequency	18	, 0	3		
Percentage	84.2	0	15.8		

"MAKING CABLE WORK"

WORKSHOP # 2 - EVALUATION

SUMMARY EVALUATION

Total No. of Returned Questionnaires - 9

1. Do you feel that the workshop has improved your ability to become active in the organization of a government access channel?

	1	. 2	. 3	4
	Good Improvement	Some Improvement	Little Improvement	No Improvement At All
Absolute Frequency	4	5	0	0
Percentage	44.4	55.6	0.0	0.0

2. Do you feel that the examples of government access channels discussed during the workshop were representative of your local needs and problems?

	1	2	3	4
	Extremely Representative	Very Representative	Fairly Representative	Unrelated to My Local Needs and Problems
Absolute Frequency	2	4	3	0
Percentag	ge 22.2	44.4	33.3	0.0

3. Are there additional topic areas you would like to have covered in the workshop discussions that you attended on government access channels? Please comment.

Total number of comments = 2

- 1) "specific examples of programming in Connecticut"
- 2) "utility of having such a channel in the first place"
- 4. Did you find the PUCA discussions useful?

	1	2	3	4	5
	Extremely Useful	Very Useful	Fairly Useful	Little Use	Not Useful At All
Absolute1 Frequency	0.	6	3	0	0
Percentage	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0

5. Were there any additional issues related to the PUCA and the role of the municipalities you would like to have covered in the discussion? Please comment.

Total number of comments = 2

- 1) "no well rounded"
- 2) "the PUCA appears to be not willing to be helpful to CATV interest"
- 6. Do you feel that you NOW have enough awareness of programming and video technology to become active in the development of government access programming?

		2	3	4
	Expert Knowledge	l Feel I Have Adequate Knowledge	I Know Some But Would Like to Know More	I Know Little About the Topics
Absolute Frequency	2	3	4	0
Percentage	22.2	33.3	44.4	0.0

7. How would you rate the overall utility of this workshop?

	1	2	3	4	5
	Extremely Useful	Very Useful	Fairly Useful	Little Use	Not Useful At All
Absolute Frequency	5 -	4	0	0	0
Percentage	55.6	44.4	0.0	0.0	0.0

8. Are you a member of a Local Advisory Council?

	Yes /	No	0 = no reply
Absolute Frequency	4	4	1
Percentage	44.4	44.4	11.1

0	Did	VOII	attend	tho	Santambar	26	Conference	2+	CPTV
9.	UIG	you	arrend	rne	september	20	Conterence	01	CLIA

	->	Yes //	No
Absolute Frequency		6	. 3
Percentage		66.7	33.3

10. Did you attend the November 22 Community Access Workshop at Valley Cable Vision?

variey Cable Vision:	Yes //	No
Absolute Frequency	6	3
Percentage	66.7	33.3

II. How did you learn about the workshop? (check the following)

IPS Newsletter Workshop Mailing Supt. of Schools			r <u>l</u>	_	Town Chie	ve	
			ing _2	_	Town-₁Lib	6	
			ols	_	Franchise		
C	Counc	il Chair	man	<u>.</u>			0 = no reply
_		1	2	4	6	7	0
Absolute Frequenc		2	3	1	1	1	1
Percenta	ge	22.2	33.3	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1

Would you like to serve on the Steering Committee for Workshop # 4 in February?

rebruary?	Yes //	No /
Absolute Frequency	1	8
Percentage	11.1	88.9



INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC SERVICE THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

STORRS, CONNECTICUT

SUMMARY STATEMENTS "MAKING CABLE WORK" PROJECT*

1) dolers 4 45 - Unnuary 29, 1976 - CABLE RAVE Meriden, Conn.

FINAL SURVEY INSTRUMENT LUCAL ADVISORY COUNCIL QUESTIONNAIRE #2

BY: Robert A. Baukus Special Research' Technician

4/9/76

*This survey was partially financed by a grant from the Commission for Higher Education, State of Connecticut, under Program IMPACT, College Community Service Programs, little Lof Higher Education Act of 1965.

WORKSHOP #3.

"Making Cable Work" Project PARTICIPANT CONFIDENTIAL EVALUATION

CableRAVE 22 Liberty Street Meriden, Conn. Thursday, Jan. 29, 1976

Summary Statement

Total Number of Returned Questionnaires - 16

1) Did you find the discussion of programming of Channel CableRave Useful?

	1	2	3	4	5	
Extre Usefu	,	Very Useful	Fairly Useful	Little Use	Not at All Useful	No Reply
Absolute Frequency	3	11	2	0	0	0
Percentage	18.8	68.8	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0

2) Did the discussion of funding sources provide useful information?

	1	2	3	4	5	
Extre Usefu		Very Useful	Fairly Useful	Little Use	Not at All Useful	No Reply
Absolute Frequency	0	6	10	0	0	0
Percentage	0.0	37.5	62.5	0.0	0.0	0.0

3) Do you feel that the workshop has improved your ability to become active in the organization of educational and instructional activities on your local channel?

	1	2	3	4	5	
Extre	eme ovement	Great Improvement	Some Improvement	Little Improvement	No. Improve- ment at All	No Reply
Absolute Frequency	3	7	6	0	0	0
Percentage	18.8	43.8	37.5	0.0	0.0	0.0

• 4) Did the tape of the "Public Use of Public Channel's" Conference at CPTV provide you with helpful information?

	1	2	3	4	5	
Extre	mely	Very	Fairly	Little	Not Helpful	No Reply
Helpf		Helpful	Helpful	Help	At All	
Absolute Frequency	1	3	2	0	0	10
Percentage	6.3	18.8	12.5	0.0	0.0	62.5

5) Did you feel that the "Call-In" from Meriden-Wallingford CATV viewers was successful?

	1	2		3	4	5		
Extrem		Very Success	ful	Fairly Successful	Somewhat Successful	Not Succe at All	ssful	No Reply
Absolute Frequency	0	3	,	1	0	0		12
Percentage	0.0	18.8		6.3	0.0	0.0		75.0
6) Do you channe		hat the "	call-in	" system coul	d be utiliz	ed on your	local	
<u></u>	yes Z	_/ no	<u>/</u> / o	don't know <u>/</u>	/// I inten find ou		Reply	
Absolute Frequency	5	0		1	1		9	
Percentage 7) How wo	31.3 ould you	0.0 rate the	overall	6.3 utility of		p? .	6.3	
Extremuse fu	mely	Very Useful		Fairly Useful	Little Use	Not at al Useful		No Reply
Absolute Frequency	3	10		1	. 0	0		2
Percentage	18.8	62.5		6.3	0.0	0.0		12.5
8) Are yo	u a memb	er of a Lo	ocal Ad	visory Counci	I /_/ Yes	/_/ No		No Reply
Absolute Frequency					9	7		0
Percentage					56.3	43.8		0.0
Na	me of Pa	rticipant	6	8.8 given	(optional)		
Mu	inicipali	ty or Cour	ncil		(optional)		
9) Did yo	ou attend	d the Sept	ember 2	26 Conference	at CPTV? /	/ Yes /_	_/ No	No Reply
Absolute Frequency		121				8 7		1

Did you attend the Workshop #1?	Yes /_/	No /_/	No Reply
Absolute Frequency	6	7	3
Percentage	37.5	43.8	18.8
Did you attend the Workshop #2?	Yes /_/	No /_/	No Reply
Absolute Frequency	7	7	2
Percentage	43.8	43.8	12.5
10) Did you like the format of this v	workshop? Yes	No	No Reply
Absolute Frequency	. 14	1	1
Percentage	87.5	6.3	6.3

"program lasted too long"
"yes - but talk was too long"
"like sharing with other members"

II) How did you learn about workshop? (check the following:)

Absolu	ite Frequency	Percentage
IPS Newsletter	6	37.5
Workshop Mailing	5	31.3
Supt. of Schools	1	6.3
. Council Chairman	1	6.3
Town Chief Executive		0.0
Town Librarian	1	6.3
Franchise Operator	2	12.5
Other (please explain)	2	12.5

Sources listed in other category:

R. Baukus 1/10/76

⁻steering committee -School Audio Visual Director

FINAL SURVEY INSTRUMENT

"MAKING CABLE WORK"

PROJECT

Local Advisory Council Questionnaire #2 SUMMARY STATEMENT

Total Number Of Returned Questionnaires = 33

How many workshops of the "Making Cable Work" Project did you attend?

a) CPTV Conference / / b) Workshop #1 / / c) Workshop #2 / /

(please put a check to indicate attendance)

Please put a check on the answer point that corresponds to the best answer to the questions.

1)

Absolute Frequency		21		23	2	
Percentage		63.6		69.7		3.6
d) Wor	kshop #3	/	e) Work	shop #4 /_/		
Absolute Frequency		24		17		
Percentage		72.7		51.5	<u>5</u>	
	member of	a Local	Advisory C	Council? Yes		Reply /_/
Absolute						
Frequency					17 15	1
Percentage					51.5 45.5	3.0
a) Nam	ne of Parti	cip a nt _		90.9 % qive	n(op	tional)
b) Mun	lcipality	or Counc	"		(op	tional)
c) Fra	nchise are	a			(op	tional)
•					urrently active?	
	2	5-1-1-	4	No activity	6	0
Active	Active	Active	Activity	at all	never contacted	No Reply
Absolute 0 Frequency	5	9	5	5	3	6
Percent-						
age 0.0	15.2	27.3	15.2	15.2	9.1	18.2
				22		

3b) Please comment on the exact nature of the current activities of your LAC.

"We are poorly informed on Cable activities kept in dark about local activities"

"Know nothing of legislation"

"We meet bimonthly"

"Nothing"

"Will be writing guidelines for access channels"

"Seeking to establish public access thru trial program, securing equipment, advising on selection of director of community access"

"Inventoried hardware & software in each town; had DCA presentation on governmental channel, plan to study uses of access channels"

"held public meetings to explain function of CPTV"

"Invoking & re-consideration of the franchise tariff to require drops at all schools at no cost"

"It is impossible to find out who the other council members are or anything about advisory council functions"

"No publicity about council, e.g. who is on it, how appointed, what they do; if they meet."

How many members have been appointed to your local advisory council? 4) (Please circle) No a) 5 or less b) 6-10 c) 11-15 d) 16-20 e) 21 or more Reply Absolute 7 8 9 2 6 Frequency 18.2 3.0 21.3 24.2 27.3 6.1 Percentage

5) How would you rate your council's effectiveness. (Please circle)

b) Good c) Fair d) Poor No Reply a) Very Good Absolute 7 8 5 11 Frequency 2 Percentage 6.1 24.2 15.3 33.3 21.2

6) What is your sex? (Please circle)

a) Male b) Female No Reply

Absolute Frequency 17 15 1

Percentage 51.5 .45.4 3.0

7) What is your age? (Please circle)

a) 25-30 yrs. b) 30-35 yrs. c) 35-40 yrs. d) 40-45 yrs. Reply

Absolute
Frequency 4 3 7 0 2

Percentage 12.1 9.1 21.2 0.0 6.1

No

Occupation	N	% N:
Public Administration	0	0
School Administration	ı	3
College Educator	3	9
School Educator	3	9
Audio Visual Specialist	8	24.2
Librarian	6	18.1
Business	1	3
Professional	3	9
Craftsman	0	0
Clergy	0	0
Cable Operator	4	12.1
Housewife	3	9
Retired	ı	3
Not Listed	33	99.4ª

^aColumns do not total 100 percent due to rounding. 9) Did you discuss information and/or activities that you learned about at the "Making Cable Work" conference and workshops with other members of your LAC who did not attend the meetings?

your End !	2	3	4		
Always	Usually	Sometimes	Never	No Reply	
Absolute 8 Frequency	11	4	4	6	
Percent- 24.2	33.3	12.1	12.1	18.2	

10) How would you rate the overall utility of:

Conference:		2	3	4	·5	
	Extremely Useful	Very Useful	Fairly Useful	Little Use	Not Useful at All	No Reply
Absolute Frequency	7	10	•10	0	0	6
Percentage	21.2	30.3	30.3	0.0	0.0	18.2
Workshops:	1	2	3	4	5	
	Extremely Useful	Very Useful	Fairly Useful	Little Use	Not Useful at All	No Reply
Absolute Frequency	6	14 .	11	0	0	2
Percentage	18.2	42.4	33.3	0.0	0.0	6.1

11) Have the "Making Cable Work" Project Workshops influenced you and/or your Local Advisory Council (LAC) in any of the following areas:

No Reply	Great Improve- ment	Some Improve- ment	Little Improve- ment	No Improve- ment	Uncertain	
16 48.5	3.0	5 15.2	4 12.1	3 9.1	4 12.1	Internal organization of LAC
16 48.5	1 3.0	3 9.1	6 18.2	2 6.1	5 1 5 .2	Relationship between community and LAC
16 48.5	3 9.1	5 15.2	2 6.1	3 9.1	4 12.1	Relationship between cable operator and LAC
16 48.5	3.0	3.0	3 9.1	5 15.2	21.2	Improved funding methods
8 24.2 9	7 21.2	15 45.5	2 6.1	0 0.0	3.0	Awareness of CATV rules and regulations
27.3	8 2 4 .2	13 39.9	2 6.1	0 0.0	3.0	Awareness of CATV tech- nology
11 33.3	3 9.1	8 24.2	5 15.2	3 9.1	3 9.1	Community awareness of CATV and its potential
11 3 3.3	6 18.2	10 30.3	4 12.1	1 3.0	1 3.0	Awareness of program production methods
13 39.4	8 24.2	8 24.2	2 6.1	1 3.0	1 3.0	Awareness of educational and instructional pro- gramming
14 42.4	1 3.0	0 0.0	.7 21.2	7 21.2	4 12.1	Increase in number of community access users
13 39.4	1 3.0	3 9.1	7 21.2	6 18.2	3 9.1	Development of government access programming
10 30.3	7 21.2	10 30.3	2 6.1	2 .6.1	2 6.1	Development of educational & instructional program-
14 42.4	3 9.1	7 21.2	2 6.1	4 12.1	3 9.1	Improvement in overall effectiveness of LAC
12 36.4	5 15.2	5 15.2	8 24.2	.1 3.0	2 6.1	Awareness of programming sources
15 45.5	3.0	4 12.1	3 9.1	6 18.2	4 12.1	Development of working relationship with other LAC's
14 42.4	1 3.0	4 12.1	5 15.2	5 15.2	4 12.1	Development of a public information campaign
16 48.5	3.0	0 0.0	2 6.1	9 27.3	5 15.2	Contact with local ethnic resource groups

12) Do you feel that additional cable television workshops and conferences should be organized for our State. Please comment.

"Make a videotape of Dr. Howard Jacobson's lecture available for all councils"

"Organize, structure and present cable information to the State Legislature"

"Workshop topic stressing the need to use the CATV potential or lose it"

"Workshops are needed that will stimulate regional school systems' involvement with CATV"

"Don't stop now - continue a program of public awareness of CATV"

"Need to stress community access"

"Yes - sponsored and coordinated by IPS"

"Develop a public information campaign about CATV"

"Workshop on organizing grass roots participation for government and public access channels"

"More Information about FCC regulations of CATV indicating stressing issues such as copyright"

"PUCA and Its relations to CATV in Connecticut"

"No, workshops accomplish little"

"Present active CATV programmers to the council members so ideas and tapes can be exchanged"

	Yes	No	No Reply
Absolute Frequency	27	4	2
Percentage	81.1	12.1	6.1

13) Would you or your Council (LAC) like to review edited tapes of the CPTV Conference and the Workshop Series?

	Yes /_/	No //	No Reply
Absolute Frequency	14	9	10
Percentage	42.4	27.3	30.3

RB

IPS - 4/2/76